



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,766	06/06/2006	Yong Hwan Kim	930086-2028	8494
7590 Ronald R. Santucci c/o Frommer Lawrence & Haug 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			EXAMINER HEINCE, LIAM J	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/581,766

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Liam J. Heincer

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Liam J. Heincer.(3) Howard Lee.(2) Mark Eashoo.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the Giutsu et al. and Sjoholm et al. references were not from the same field of endeavor. Additionally, applicant pointed to results in the specification to show the unexpected nature of the invention. Finally, possible experiments to show unexpected results were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796